



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/693,585	10/24/2003	Klaus U. Schutz	MSI-1819US	1086
22801	7590	12/04/2006	EXAMINER	
LEE & HAYES PLLC 421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500 SPOKANE, WA 99201				COLAN, GIOVANNA B
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2162				

DATE MAILED: 12/04/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/693,585	SCHUTZ ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Giovanna Colan	2162	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 September 2006.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 9-14 and 17-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 9-14 and 17-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is issued in response to the Amendment filed on 09/07/2006.
2. No claims were amended. Claims 1 – 8, 15 – 16, and 24 – 32 were canceled. No claims were added.
3. This action is made Final.
4. Claims 9 – 14, and 17 – 23 are pending in this application.
5. Applicant's arguments filed on 09/07/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Election/Restrictions

6. Applicant's orally election with traverse of Group II on May 16, 2006, is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that; "Groups I and II can both be said to relate to privileged access".

This is not found persuasive because, as stated in Office Action June 8, 2006, each of the five inventions are distinct from each other if they are shown to be separately usable. For example, Group I has a separate utility such as generating a database or a data structures, by specifically "communicating the translated credential ..." and further "calling a logon routine ...". On the other hand, Group II has a separate utility such as privileged access, by specifically "receiving a credential ...", "translating ...", and "further using a component ...". Therefore, each of these inventions includes different processes, and does not require the particulars of the remaining inventions.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

8. **Claim 9 – 11, 13 – 14, 17 – 19, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Botz et al. (Botz hereinafter) (US Patent App. Pub. No. 2003/0177388 A1, filed: March 15, 2002).**

Regarding Claim 9, Botz discloses a method comprising:

receiving a credential from a user at an input device in communication with a local machine having an OS (Page 1 and 2, [0007] and [0033], lines 11 – 13, and 3 – 5 and 10 – 11, Botz¹);

translating the credential with one of different coexisting credential provider modules for translating respectively different types of credentials into a common credential protocol (Page 1, [0007], lines 13 – 17, Botz²); and

¹ Wherein the step of forwarding implies the step of receiving the credential claimed. And wherein the user ID and password corresponds to the credential claimed.

² Wherein the authenticated user identity corresponds to the credential (being translated) claimed; the initial authentication unit corresponds to one of different coexisting credential provider modules claimed; and the local user identity corresponds to the common credential protocol claimed.

using a component of the OS to authenticate the translated credential having the common credential protocol against a credential database (Page 1, [0008], lines 6 – 9, Botz³); and

logging the user on with the OS to access the local machine when the authentication is successful (Page 3, [0034], lines 7 – 13, Botz⁴).

Regarding Claim 10, Botz discloses a method, wherein the logging of the user on further comprises logging the user on to the local machine after a plurality of said credentials have been received, translated by a respective said different coexisting credential provider module, and authenticated successfully (Page 7, [0094], lines 6 – 10, Botz⁵).

Regarding Claim 11, Botz discloses a method, wherein the user is not logged on to the local machine at the time when the translated credentials are authenticated (Page 7, [0094], lines 6 – 10, Botz).

Regarding Claim 13, Botz discloses a method, wherein each said credential provider module is interoperable, through a credential provider API, to the component of the OS (Fig. 4, item 402, Page 5, [0071], lines 1 – 4, the interfaces services, Botz).

³ Wherein the step to subsequent authenticate corresponds to the step to authenticate claimed.

⁴ Wherein the step of sign-on corresponds to the step of logging the user claimed.

⁵ Wherein the step of using the policy information, including trust policy and initial authentication, to signing the user on (Page 7, [0094], lines 1 – 6, Botz) corresponds to the step of logging the user claimed. In addition, Botz discloses the use of a plurality of credentials as claimed (Page 7, [0101], lines 3 – 14, Botz).

Regarding Claim 14, Botz discloses a computer-readable medium comprising instructions that, when executed by a computer (Page 2, [0030], lines 1 – 4, Botz).

Regarding Claim 17, Botz discloses a method comprising:
receiving a credential from a user at an input device in communication with a local machine having an OS (Page 1 and 2, [0007] and [0033], lines 11 – 13, and 3 – 5 and 10 – 11; respectively, Botz⁶);
translating the credential with a credential provider module that corresponds to the input device (Page 1 and 3, [0007] and [0046], lines 13 – 17 and 1 – 10; respectively, Botz⁷), wherein:

the credential provider module is one of a plurality of coexisting different said credential provider modules (Page 3, [0042], lines 1 – 5, a particular server within a defined trust set of servers, Botz); and

each said credential provider module can perform a translation of a respectively different type of said credential received at a different said input device in communication with the local machine (Page 1 and 4, [0007] and [0050], lines 13 – 17 and 1 – 6; respectively, Botz); and

each said translation of each said credential is in a common credential protocol (Page 1, [0007], lines 13 – 17, Botz⁸);

⁶ Wherein the step of forwarding implies the step of receiving the credential claimed. And wherein the user ID and password corresponds to the credential claimed.

⁷ Wherein the step of identifying to a particular server (Page 3, [0046], lines 4 – 8, Botz) corresponds to the step of translating to the corresponding input device claimed.

communicating the translated credential having the common credential protocol through a credential provider interface to a logon UI routine of the OS (Page 7, [0090], lines 1 – 5, Botz⁹);

passing the translated credential having the common credential protocol to a logon routine of the OS from the logon UI routine (page 7, [0091], lines 1 – 4, Botz);

authenticating the translated credential against a credential database with the logon routine of the OS (Page 1 and 7, [0008] and [0092], lines 6 – 9 and 1 – 5; respectively, Botz¹⁰); and

logging the user on to access the local machine with the OS when the authentication is successful (Page 3 and 7, [0034] and [0094], lines 7 – 13 and 6 – 10; respectively, Botz¹¹).

Regarding Claim 18, Botz discloses a method, wherein the logging the user on to access the local machine with the OS further comprises deferring the logging on of the user to access the local machined until the receiving, the translating, the communicating, the passing, and the authenticating successfully have been repeated

⁸ Wherein the local user identity corresponds to the common credential protocol claimed.

⁹ Wherein the identity translation token (ITT) and/or the identity translation token reference (ITTR) correspond to the translated credential claimed. And wherein the server's interface services correspond to the credential provided interface claimed. Botz specifically discloses the logon UI routine in Page 7, [0092], and lines 1 – 8.

¹⁰ Wherein the step of performing subsequent authentication corresponds to the step of authenticating claimed.

¹¹ Wherein the step of sign-on corresponds to the step of logging the user claimed.

for each of a plurality of said credentials (Page 7, [0094], lines 6 – 10, Botz¹²).

Regarding Claim 19, Botz discloses a method, wherein the user is not logged on to access the local machine when the translated credentials are authenticated against the credential database with the logon routine of the OS (Page 7, [0094], lines 6 – 10, Botz).

Regarding Claim 21, Botz discloses a computer-readable medium comprising instructions that, when executed by a computer, perform the method of claim 17 (Page 2, [0030], lines 1 – 4, Botz).

Regarding Claim 22, Botz discloses a computer-readable medium comprising a credential provider module including instructions that, when executed by a local machine having an OS, receive and translate a credential into a credential protocol so as to be compatible for authentication by an authentication component of the OS against a credential database for logging a user identified by the credential on with the OS to access the local machine when the authentication is successful, wherein:

the translated credential can be received via an interface to the authentication component of the OS (Page 1 and 2, [0007] and [0033], lines 11 – 13, and 3 – 5 and 10 – 11; respectively, Botz¹³);

¹² Wherein the step of using the policy information, including trust policy and initial authentication, to signing the user on (Page 7, [0094], lines 1 – 6, Botz) corresponds to the step of logging the user claimed. In addition, Botz discloses the use of a plurality of credentials as claimed (Page 7, [0101], lines 3

the interface (Fig. 3, items 314, and 316, Page 4, [0058], lines 1 – 4, Botz) to the authentication component of the OS is compatible for receiving each of a plurality of said credentials (Page 1 and 2, [0007] and [0033], lines 11 – 13, and 3 – 5 and 10 – 13; respectively; wherein the step of forwarding implies the step of receiving the credential claimed. And wherein the user ID and password corresponds to the credential claimed; Botz) from a corresponding plurality of different coexisting credential provider modules (Page 1 and 4, [0007] and [0050], lines 13 – 17 and 1 – 6, multiple security user registries of multiple computer platforms; respectively, Botz); and

each said different coexisting credential provider module can:

receive a respective different type of said credential from a respective input device (Fig.10, items 1104, 1108, 1110, and 1112, Page 9, [0123], lines 8 – 11, Botz¹⁴); and

translate each said different type of said credential into the credential protocol so as to be compatible for authentication by the authentication component of the OS against the credential database (Page 3, [0039], lines 1 – 6, an infrastructure to support run-time cooperation between disparate security registry user, Botz).

– 14, Botz). By signing the user on after the information if authenticated, the system is deferring the signing on or logging on.

¹³ Wherein the step of forwarding implies the step of receiving the credential claimed. And wherein the user ID and password corresponds to the credential claimed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

11. **Claims 12, 20, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Botz et al. (Botz hereinafter) (US Patent App. Pub. No. 2003/0177388 A1, filed: March 15, 2002) in view of Axel et al. (Axel hereinafter) (US Patent App. Pub. No. 2004/0139355 A1, filed: November 7, 2002).**

¹⁴ Wherein examiner interprets the step where a first user signs on using Public Key infrastructure (PKI), and a second user signs on using Kerberos (Page 9, [0123], lines 8 – 11, Botz) as the step of receiving different type of credential from respective input device as claimed.

Regarding Claim 12, Botz discloses all the limitations as disclosed above including a method, wherein the use of the component of the OS to authenticate the translated credential having the common credential protocol against the credential database further comprises:

communicating the translated credential to an LSA (Page 7, [0090], lines 1 – 5, Botz¹⁵); and

determining the authentication with the LSA against the credential database (Page 7, [0090], lines 6 – 9, Botz¹⁶) that is selected from the group consisting of:

a local database other than the SAM database (Page 5, [0069], lines 3 – 5, local user registry, Botz);

a remote credential database (Page 5, [0067], lines 12 – 14, LDAP-accessible storage, Botz¹⁷);

a token protocol credential service (Page 9, [0133], lines 2 – 6, HyperText Transfer Protocol (HTTP), Botz);

a challenge and response protocol service (Page 9, [0133], lines 1 – 6, HyperText Transfer Protocol (HTTP), Botz¹⁸);

¹⁵ Wherein examiner interprets the AIT domain controller as the LSA claimed; and the identity translation token (ITT) and/or the identity translation token reference (ITTR) as the translated credential claimed.

¹⁶ Wherein the step of validating the translated token using a copy of the signing value retained at the AIT domain controller corresponds to the step of determining the authentication against the credential database as claimed. In addition, Botz further discloses that this controller utilizes databases to store the information (Page 6, [0086], lines 3 – 7, Botz).

¹⁷ Wherein the LDPA-accessible storage corresponds to the remote credential database claimed. The reason is because this storage is retrieved upon a server session, which would imply a remote session.

In addition, Botz further discloses KDC (Fig. 10, item 1102, Kerberos, Botz). However, Botz is silent with respect to a SAM database; and an AD at a domain remote from the local machine. On the other hand, Axel discloses a system including a SAM database (Page 2, [0018], lines 3 – 5, Axel); an AD (Page 2, [0017], lines 4 – 5, Axel) and KDC at a domain remote from the local machine (Page 2, [0017], lines 1 – 3, Axel); and an LSA (Page 2, [0021], lines 1 – 2, Axel). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the Axel's teachings to the system Botz. Skilled artisan would have been motivated to do so, as suggested by Axel (Page 1, [0002], lines 1 – 4, Axel), to provide access to various password-enabled computer network elements through the use of a single password enabled network element. In addition, both of the references (Botz and Axel) teach features that are directed to analogous art and they are directed to the same field of endeavor of databases management systems, such as, authentication, and login users. This close relation between both of the references highly suggests an expectation of success.

Regarding Claim 20, the combination of Botz in view of Axel ("Botz/Axel" hereinafter) discloses a method, wherein the authenticating of the translated credential against the credential database with the logon routine of the OS further comprises:

¹⁸ Wherein the feature of extracting corresponds to the challenge claimed; and the feature of passing corresponds to the response claimed.

communicating the translated credential to an LSA from the logon routine of the OS (Page 7, [0090], lines 1 – 5, Botz¹⁹; and Page 2, [0021], lines 1 – 2, LSA, Axel); and determining the authentication with the LSA against the credential database (Page 7, [0090], lines 6 – 9, Botz²⁰; and Page 2, [0021], lines 1 – 2, LSA, Axel) that is selected from the group consisting of:

- a SAM database (Page 2, [0018], lines 3 – 5, Axel);
- a local database other than the SAM database (Page 5, [0069], lines 3 – 5, local user registry, Botz);
- a remote credential database (Page 5, [0067], lines 12 – 14, LDAP-accessible storage, Botz²¹);
- a token protocol credential service (Page 9, [0133], lines 2 – 6, HyperText Transfer Protocol (HTTP), Botz);
- a challenge and response protocol service (Page 9, [0133], lines 1 – 6, HyperText Transfer Protocol (HTTP), Botz²²); and
- an AD (Page 2, [0017], lines 4 – 5, Axel) and KDC at a domain remote from the local machine (Page 2, [0017], lines 1 – 3, Axel; and Fig. 10, item 1102, Kerberos, Botz).

¹⁹ Wherein examiner interprets the AIT domain controller as the LSA claimed; and the identity translation token (ITT) and/or the identity translation token reference (ITTR) as the translated credential claimed.

²⁰ Wherein the step of validating the translated token using a copy of the signing value retained at the AIT domain controller corresponds to the step of determining the authentication against the credential database as claimed. In addition, Botz further discloses that this controller utilizes databases to store the information (Page 6, [0086], lines 3 – 7, Botz).

²¹ Wherein the LDPA-accessible storage corresponds to the remote credential database claimed. The reason is because this storage is retrieved upon a server session, which implies a remote session.

Regarding Claim 23, Botz/Axel discloses a computer-readable medium, wherein the authentication component of the OS comprises:

a logon UI module (Page 6, [0076], lines 1 – 5, Botz);
an OS logon module for receiving Remote Procedure Call (RPC) calls from the log UI module (Page 6, [0083], lines 1 – 5, remote sign-on, Botz); and
an LSA for determining the authentication, and in communication with, the credential database (Page 7, [0090], lines 6 – 9, Botz²³) that is selected from the group consisting of:

a SAM database (Page 2, [0018], lines 3 – 5, Axel);
a local database other than the SAM database (Page 5, [0069], lines 3 – 5, local user registry, Botz);
a remote credential database (Page 5, [0067], lines 12 – 14, LDAP-accessible storage, Botz²⁴);
a token protocol credential service (Page 9, [0133], lines 2 – 6, HyperText Transfer Protocol (HTTP), Botz);
a challenge and response protocol service (Page 9, [0133], lines 1 – 6, HyperText Transfer Protocol (HTTP), Botz²⁵); and

²² Wherein the feature of extracting corresponds to the challenge claimed; and the feature of passing corresponds to the response claimed.

²³ Wherein the step of validating the translated token using a copy of the signing value retained at the AIT domain controller corresponds to the step of determining the authentication against the credential database as claimed. In addition, Botz further discloses that this controller utilizes databases to store the information (Page 6, [0086], lines 3 – 7, Botz).

²⁴ Wherein the LDPA-accessible storage corresponds to the remote credential database claimed. The reason is because this storage is retrieved upon a server session, which implies a remote session.

²⁵ Wherein the feature of extracting corresponds to the challenge claimed; and the feature of passing corresponds to the response claimed.

an AD (Page 2, [0017], lines 4 – 5, Axel) and KDC at a domain remote from the local machine (Page 2, [0017], lines 1 – 3, Axel; and Fig. 10, item 1102, Kerberos, Botz).

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant argues that the prior art fails to disclose; “ translating the credential with one of different coexisting credential provider modules for translating respectively different types of credentials into a common credential protocol”.

Examiner respectfully disagrees. The applied art Botz does disclose: translating the credential with one of different coexisting credential provider modules for translating respectively different types of credentials into a common credential protocol (Page 1, [0007], lines 13 – 17; translating the authenticated user identity of the initial authentication unit ... ; Botz). Wherein the authenticated user identity corresponds to the credential (being translated) claimed; the initial authentication unit corresponds to one of different coexisting credential provider modules claimed; and the local user identity corresponds to the common credential protocol claimed. Additionally, Botz further discloses details regarding: different coexisting credential provider modules (Fig. 13, items 1406, 1408, and 1410, Page 1, and 9, [0010], and [0141], lines 14 – 18, and 1 – 5; respectively; ... encompasses multiple disparate security user registries ... ; Botz).

2. Applicant argues that the prior art fails to disclose; “any system that allows the user multiple ways to “sign on” to the system”.

Examiner respectfully disagrees. The specific limitation including: “any system that allows the user multiple ways to “sign on” to the system” is not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification,

Art Unit: 2162

limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

3. Applicant argues that the prior art fails to disclose; "wherein the credential provider module is one of a plurality of coexisting different said credential provider modules".

Examiner respectfully disagrees. The applied art Botz does disclose: "wherein the credential provider module is one of a plurality of coexisting different said credential provider modules (See – Argument 1 in this Office Action above).

4. Applicant argues that the prior art fails to disclose; "whether or not the other servers within the "defined trust set of servers" are authentication servers".

Examiner respectfully disagrees. The specific limitation including: "whether or not the other servers within the "defined trust set of servers" are authentication servers" is not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

5. Applicant argues that the prior art fails to disclose; "the interface to the authentication component of the OS is compatible for receiving each of a plurality of said credentials from a corresponding plurality of different coexisting credential provider modules".

Examiner respectfully disagrees. The applied art Botz does disclose that: the interface (Fig. 3, items 314, and 316, Page 4, [0058], lines 1 – 4, Botz) to the authentication component of the OS is compatible for receiving each of a plurality of said credentials (Page 1 and 2, [0007] and [0033], lines 11 – 13, and 3 – 5 and 10 – 13; respectively; wherein the step of forwarding implies the step of receiving the credential claimed. And wherein the user ID and password corresponds to the credential claimed; Botz) from a corresponding plurality of different coexisting credential provider modules (Page 1 and 4, [0007], lines 13 – 17 and 1 – 6; respectively, Botz). Furthermore, Botz also discloses details regarding: different coexisting credential provider modules (See – Argument 1 in this Office Action above).

Conclusion

1. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

2. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Prior Art Made Of Record

1. Botz et al. (US Patent App. Pub. No. 2003/0177388 A1, filed: March 15, 2002) discloses authenticated identity translation within a multiple computing unit environment.
2. Axel et al. (US Patent App. Pub. No. 2004/0139355 A1, filed: November 7, 2002) discloses a method and system of accessing a plurality of network elements.
3. Hartman et al. (US Patent No. 6,807,636 B2) discloses methods and apparatus for facilitating security in a network.

Points Of Contact

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Giovanna Colan whose telephone number is (571) 272-2752. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Giovanna Colan
Examiner
Art Unit 2162
November 25, 2006



Sana Al-Hashem